

REMARKS

This request for continued examination (RCE) under Rule 114 is in response to the decision on the Petition issued January 31, 2007 and the final Office Action mailed May 18, 2001. In a telephone conference with Examiner Lee on February 28, 2007, it was agreed that Applicant would file this RCE in response to the denial of Applicant's request to withdrawal abandonment and the Examiner's determination that new issues were raised by the Rule 116 amendment filed on October 18, 2001. **In that no outstanding issues now remain in the application, this application should be in condition for allowance and an expedited notice thereof is requested in view of the USPTO's extraordinarily long delay in responding to Applicant's petition.**

Specifically in response to the final Office Action, Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claim 1 and indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-3, 4-11, 12-24, and 25-29. Claims 2-3, 4-11, 12-24, 25-29, and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2) while claims 30 and 31 were rejected under § 102(b). The Examiner further noted a number of informalities with previously entered amendments. In response thereto, claims 2-4, 11-15, 17, 20, 23-25, and 28-29 have now been amended and claims 30-31 have been canceled. Claims 1-17 and 19-29 remain in the application. In view of this amendment and remarks herein, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention is directed to a coupling device as seen in FIG. 3 that consists of upper and lower connecting plates 100 and 101 with external flanges parallel to transmission line 103 for coupling RF energy for forward power detection. The coupling device 100 incorporates a helix structure with rotation centered near or about transmission line 103 and incorporates

embedded secondary structures which are parallel to transmission line and fixed a predetermined distance from the transmission line 103. These plurality of parallel flanges are used to increase the coupling coefficient and directivity of the helix coupler 107 and maintain geometries that optimize magnetic field coupling. One or more vias 102 are used to connect individual upper connecting plate 100 and individual lower connecting plate 101 to form the overall helix structure. The addition of the parallel flanges to upper and lower connecting plates allow for a greater coupling efficiency per unit length of transmission line 103.

With regard to the Examiner objection to the specification, and the indication of subject matter not entered on page 3, line 13 will not be entered, this had been noted by Applicant. With the Examiner's permission, this specific amendment will not be entered. Other additional amendments have been made that are consistent with the Examiner's requirements. In that amendments were entered to different lines than those indicated in the amendment, Applicant has made its best attempt to correct the wording and syntax such that the specification should now be in a correct format. Applicant would be willing be make any specific amendment to the specification and if not correct, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned. It should noted, however, that contrary to the Examiner's comments, no amendments to the drawings were done in the first response. Accordingly, it is unclear how to respond to the Examiner's comments in this regard.

As far as the rejection on the merits, claims 2, 3, 4-11, 12-24, 25-29, 30, and 31 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response

Applicant : Charles Ruelke
Appln. No. : 09/307443
Page : 14

thereto, Applicant has addressed items in the first office action in detail to amend each of the areas outlined by the Examiner. In view of these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under § 112 should now be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 30-31 under § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated over Peter (of record). In response thereto, claims 30, 31 have now been withdrawn and it is requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Accordingly, this application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance. An early notice thereof is respectfully requested. No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions to expedite the allowance of this application, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 16-2463.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 29, 2007

/Frank M. Scutch III/
Frank M. Scutch III, Reg. No. 34484
PRICE, HENEVELD, COOPER,
DEWITT & LITTON, LLP
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
P.O. Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
616.949.9610